

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United Stade Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Bot. 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                  | FILING DATE                | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.    | CONFIRMATION NO.  |  |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|-------------------|--|
| 09/896,088                       | 06/28/2001                 | Carl M. Ellison      | 42390P11770            | 9497              |  |
| 8791                             | 7590 08/31/2005            |                      | EXAM                   | EXAMINER          |  |
| BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN |                            |                      | SHIFERAW               | SHIFERAW, ELENI A |  |
| 12400 WIL<br>SEVENTH             | SHIRE BOULEVARD<br>FLOOR   |                      | ART UNIT               | PAPER NUMBER      |  |
| LOS ANGI                         | LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030 |                      | 2136                   |                   |  |
|                                  |                            |                      | DATE MAILED: 08/31/200 | 5                 |  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|  | Application No.   | Applicant(s)  | _                                     |  |  |  |
|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action  | 09/896,088  | ELLISON ET AL.  |                                       |  |  |  |
| Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief   | Examiner  | Art Unit  |                                       |  |  |  |
|  | Eleni A. Shiferaw   | 2136  |                                       |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe  | ars on the cover sheet with the o   | correspondence add                                    | ress                                  |  |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED 14 July 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.   |   |   |                                       |  |  |  |
| The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: |   |   |                                       |  |  |  |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no  |   |   |                                       |  |  |  |
| event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.   |   |   |                                       |  |  |  |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f   | . ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FI<br>).  | RST REPLY WAS FILE                                    | D WITHIN TWO                          |  |  |  |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened stabove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL   | which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a<br>and the corresponding amount of the fee.<br>atutory period for reply originally set in the | The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2) | n fee under 37<br>as set forth in (b) |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com<br/>of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any e<br/>Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be<br/>AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>  | extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)  | ), to avoid dismissal o                               | of the appeal.                        |  |  |  |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because  |   |   |                                       |  |  |  |
| (a) They raise new issues that would require further co  | nsideration and/or search (see NC   |   |                                       |  |  |  |
| (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for   |   |   |                                       |  |  |  |
| appeal; and/or   |   |   |                                       |  |  |  |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.  |   |   |                                       |  |  |  |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  |   |   |                                       |  |  |  |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):  |   |   |                                       |  |  |  |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  |   |   |                                       |  |  |  |
| 7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  |   | vill be entered and an                                | explanation of                        |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) allowed:<br>Claim(s) objected to:   |   |   |                                       |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) rejected: 1-17 and 19-34.   |   |   |                                       |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE  |   |   |                                       |  |  |  |
| B.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).   |   |   |                                       |  |  |  |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessal   | overcome <u>all</u> rejections under apperry and was not earlier presented.   | al and/or appellant fa<br>See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(        | ils to provide a<br>1).               |  |  |  |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER   |   |   |                                       |  |  |  |
| 11. Σ The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.   | ut does NOT place the application   | in condition for allowa                               | ince because:                         |  |  |  |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).  13. Other:   |   |   |                                       |  |  |  |
|  |   | Primary Examina AUZISI BIZZIOZ                        |                                       |  |  |  |

Examiner disagrees with the applicant's amendments/arguments with respect to the amended claim 27, filed on July 14, 2005. Regarding claims 1, 13, 19, 27, and 34, Ohashi teaches generating a key result based on a global identifier of a source and estimated current time at the source (Ohashi col. 4 lines 51-57, abstract and fig. 7 No. 703) and Emerson discloses periodically generating a hash and periodically comparing the hash of video graphics to determine if the image blocks have changed and security is greatly improved (Emerson col.7 lines 33-53 and abstract). Regarding claims 9 and 27, Gregg suggests computing a clock skew to determine a time difference between the first computing unit in response to receipt of a first verification packet (Gregg col. 4 lines 31-46). Sufficient motivation is provided on the final rejection Office Action.